

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9

10 San Francisco Division

11 MASTEROBJECTS, INC., No. C 11-02539 JSW (LB)
12 v. Plaintiff, **ORDER REGARDING THE PARTIES'**
13 YAHOO! INC., **FEBRUARY 13, 2014 JOINT**
14 Defendant. **DISCOVERY LETTER BRIEF**
15 _____ / [Re: ECF No. 70]

16 The parties have a discovery dispute about whether Yahoo! needs to produce a Rule 30(b)(6)
17 witness to testify about matters that two of its employees previously testified about in their
18 individual capacities. *See* 2/13/2014, ECF No. 70. Yahoo! now agrees to be bound by their
19 testimony. *Id.* at 2. MasterObjects objects that the earlier depositions occurred before document
20 production and source code inspection and thus prepared for the depositions differently than it
21 would now that it has more information. *Id.* at 3. MasterObjects also notes that Yahoo! never
22 suggested previously that the individual employees' testimony would be in lieu of a Rule 30(b)(6)
23 deposition and instead said that it would produce a Rule 30(b)(6) witness upon receipt of a proper
24 notice. *Id.* at 4-5.

25 The court held a hearing on the matter on March 6, 2014. For the reasons stated on the record,
26 and with the agreement of the parties, the court **ORDERS** that Yahoo! produce a Rule 30(b)(6)
27 witness who may be deposed about the topic(s) discussed at the hearing for up to 4 hours.
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 7, 2014

LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
For the Northern District of California**